

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1-19 and 21-36 are pending. In a Final Office Action mailed on March 13, 2006, the Examiner rejected claims 1-3, 7-9, 11, 12, 17-19, 22-24, 28-30, 32-34 and 36 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 5,890,136 to Kipp ("Kipp") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,496,806 to Horwitz et al. ("Horwitz"); and rejected claims 4-6, 10, 13-16, 21, 25-27, 31 and 35 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) over Kipp in view of Horwitz and U.S. Patent No. 6,463,345 to Peachey-Kountz et al. ("Peachey-Kountz"). Applicants herein amend claims 1-4, 5-7, 11-17, 22-28 and 32-36. Further examination and review in view of the remarks below are respectfully requested.

Applicants would like to thank the Examiner for the courtesy extended to Applicants' representative during the May 3, 2006 telephone interview, during which the participants discussed Applicants' techniques, the rejection of claim 1, the Examiner's response to Applicants' prior office communication, the cited references, and proposed wording for amending the claims to overcome the cited references.

Applicants herein amend the pending claims to clearly indicate that the order database is an existing order database that is unable to track information at the level of individual units of items of an order, and that a unit order database is created using information from the existing order database. Support for the amendment that the existing order database is unable to track information at the level of individual units of items of an order can be found in the Specification at, for example, page 2, lines 3-26. For example, Applicants herein amend independent claim 1 to explicitly recite "an existing order database with an order record for each of a plurality of orders that have been booked, . . . , existing order database being unable to track information at the level of individual units of items of an order," and "creating a unit order database using information from the existing order database to include a record for each unit of each item of each order of the existing order database, . . . , each record in the unit order database having a reference to the record of the corresponding order in the existing order database." Claims 2-10 continue to depend directly or indirectly from independent claim 1. Applicants herein amend independent claim 11 to explicitly recite "means for creating a unit order database using information from an existing order database to include a record for each unit of each item of each order of the existing order database, . . . , the existing order database being unable to track


information at the level of individual units of items of an order." Claims 12-19 and 21 continue to depend directly or indirectly from independent claim 11. Applicants herein amend independent claim 22 to explicitly recite "orders being stored in an existing order database," and "creating a unit order database using information from the existing order database to include a record for each unit of each item of each order of the existing order database." Claims 23-31 continue to depend directly or indirectly from independent claim 22. Applicants herein amend independent claim 32 to explicitly recite "periodically identifying changes to orders of an existing order database of the existing order entry system," and "creating a unit order database using information from the existing order database to reflect the identified changes to the orders of the existing order database." Claims 33-35 continue to depend directly or indirectly from independent claim 32. Applicants herein amend independent claim 36 to explicitly recite "providing a conventional order processing system having an existing order database for tracking orders for units of items, each order having one or more items, each item having an associated quantity of units of that item, the conventional order processing system being unable to track information at the level of individual units of items of an order," and "augmenting the conventional order processing system with a unit order database separate from the order database, the unit order database created using information from the existing order database." As agreed upon during the May 3, 2006 telephone interview between Applicants' representative and the Examiner, these amendments to the independent claims are sufficient to overcome the cited references in that the cited references fail to disclose or suggest the claim elements as amended.

**Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-19 and 21-36 are allowable and ask that this application be passed to allowance. If the Examiner has any questions or believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is encouraged to call the undersigned at (206) 359-8000.

Respectfully submitted,

Perkins Coie LLP

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Do Te Kim', is written over a horizontal line.

Do Te Kim

Registration No. 46,231

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

**Correspondence Address:**

Customer No. 25096

Perkins Coie LLP

P.O. Box 1247

Seattle, Washington 98111-1247

(206) 359-8000